

**Appl. No.** : **09/754,406**  
**Filed** : **January 2, 2001**

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 6, 9, 11, and 21 are amended by this paper. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10, 13-20, 22-28 and 32-37 are unchanged. Claims 12 and 29-31 have been previously canceled. Claims 1-11, 13-28 and 32-37 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in light of the present remarks and the interview is respectfully requested. Applicant has amended the claims for clarification, and not to avoid any prior art and not to narrow the claims. While Applicant believes that the claims as previously pending fully complied with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicant is submitting the amendments made herein in order to expedite allowance of the application.

#### Discussion of Interviews

A telephonic interview was conducted on November 15, 2006 between Applicant's representatives and Examiner Stevens. See the Summary of Interview on page 8 herein regarding this interview.

On December 5, 2006, Applicant's representative discussed the Office communication (Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment) dated November 28, 2006 with Examiner Stevens. It was agreed that the Notice was sent in error. Nonetheless, the complete set of claims is provided herein.

#### Discussion of Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶

Claims 1-11, 13-24 and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph "as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections". In response, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 6, 9, 11 and 21.

#### Discussion of Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-11, 13-24 and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 "because the limitations denote function language does not provide a concrete tangible end result". In response, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 6, 9, 11 and 21 to provide the concrete tangible end result.

Appl. No. : 09/754,406  
Filed : January 2, 2001

Dependent Claims

The dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly on the above-discussed independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer and include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all claim rejections and prompt allowance of the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 25-28 were stated to be allowable in the Office Action dated August 10, 2006. Furthermore, all pending claims were stated as being novel in view of the prior art.

Conclusion


In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are specifically requested. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds any impediment to allowing all claims that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 12-6-2006

By:   
Raimond J. Salenieks  
Registration No. 37,924  
Agent of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550